

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

On page 2, the Examiner objects to the disclosure because the specification is missing a reference to the deposited material.

None of the biological materials described in the present specification has been deposited. It is not clear which biological material the Examiner has raised questions about. None of the biological materials described in the present specification has been deposited, but those having ordinary skill in the art can easily produce such biological materials based on the disclosure of the present specification and common technical knowledge.

In view of the foregoing, the objection of the disclosure is deemed to be overcome.

Claims 1-5, 10-11, 13-14, 16-18 and 30 are rejected under 35 USC 102 as anticipated by Commons et al. This ground of rejection is respectfully traversed as applied to the amended claims.

Specifically, naphthalene has been deleted from the definition of Ring A.

Accordingly, this ground of rejection is deemed to be overcome.

Claims 1, 6-7 and 18-23 are rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, on the basis that the specification is enabling for certain aromatic rings but not any aromatic rings.

Ring A has been limited to benzene, oxazole, thiazole, benzothiophene, benzofuran and indazole, which are supported by the Examples.

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that this ground of rejection has been overcome.

Claims 31-37 have been rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, on the basis that the specification is not enabling for prophylactics.

The term "prophylactic" has been removed from the claims.

Accordingly, this ground of rejection is deemed to be overcome.

In addition, claim 32 has been deleted without prejudice as suggested by the Examiner on page 11 of the Action.

Furthermore, claim 37 has been limited to the diseases held to be supported by the Examiner on page 8 of the Action.


Accordingly, this ground of rejection is deemed to be overcome.

Other appropriate amendments have been made which are self-explanatory. An obvious error has been corrected in claim 26, which is supported on page 19, lines 17 of the specification.

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that each ground of rejection set forth in the Official Action has been overcome, and that the application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, such allowance is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Kazumasa HAMAMURA et al.

By: 
Warren M. Cheek
Registration No. 33,367
Attorney for Applicants

WMC/dlk
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
October 30, 2007